BT
695
C74
V.1
#4

# The CREATIONIST

CAN CREATIONISTS AND EVOLUTIONISTS GET TOGETHER?

THE FETISH OF THE EVOLUTIONISTS

CASE FOR CREATION 4004 B.C.

THE DAYS OF CREATION

EARTH HISTORY TIED TO HUMAN HISTORY

LIBRARY
JAN 15 1968
Univ. of Tenn.

Volume 1 - No. 4 - December 1963 - 30¢

# Can Creationists *and* Evolutionists Get Together?

*By* Dudley Joseph Whitney, B.S., Exeter, Calif.

*Moody Monthly*, Feb. 1933

NEVER since Darwin have the proponents of organic evolution and of direct creation been farther apart than now. Numerous scholars are convinced that true science discredits the doctrine of organic evolution, but evolutionists are so convinced of the correctness of the doctrine that they give the case for creation no consideration whatever. This makes it difficult for creationists and evolutionists to get together to examine evidence.

The reason for this difference of opinion is not due to lack of evidence. Evolutionists need not wish for new evidence to uphold their case; in fact they assert that they have more evidence than they need. Creationists need not wish for evidence because they have an abundance.

### What, Then, Is the Difficulty?

The differences are due to faulty methods in reasoning from evidence. In the following discussion, therefore, the effort will not be to bring forth new evidence upon this problem of creation, but to point out lines of sound reasoning.

II

The first step is to determine what is comprised in the theory of evolution; then what is comprised in the contrasting theory of direct creation. Let the problem be restricted to the organic creation: to the origin of plants, animals and man.

The theory of direct creation simply demands that the ancestors of present plants, animals and men came into being by the special exercise of divine power. In other words, in ways transcending natural processes.

In contrast to this, organic evolution demands the origin of all living things by natural processes only. There must be no miracle, no creation by fiat, no special exercise of divine power.

### What Darwin Conceded

Of course the possibility exists that God created very simple living things by fiat and that, after they were created natural variation and selection altered their descendents into the multitudinous forms which now exist. Darwin, in fact, conceded the possibility and even the probability of this. This concept, however, is rejected by all real evolutionists. They cannot allow the creation of an amoeba so that whales and men can be derived therefrom through natural selection, nor the creation by fiat of a bacterium whose descendents are to change into ferns and oak trees by natural processes only. The theory of evolution requires natural processes from the beginning to the end.

Obviously the theory of direct creation does *not* deny the possibility of change after creation. Neither creationists (many of them) nor evolutionists (all of them) seem to realize this fact. It is one thing to have the descendants of one rabbit species change into two rabbit species, and another thing to have the rabbit descend from a lizard and the lizard from a fish. If that one simple fact could be understood by creationists and evolutionists alike, a great step in clearing away difficulties would be attained.

III

Proceeding with the analysis, the next step is to see what is required in this origin by evolution of the forms which now exist.

There are highly complex forms of animal life, like men, horses, whales, lizards and butterflies. They could not spring into being from nothing except through miracle. Evolution, therefore, has to supply them with ancestors, and those ancestors with more simple ancestors, until finally the most simple ancestors possible are reached, and these would have to originate without miracle from non-living matter or else drift to this earth through space.

### What Evolution Demands

The theory therefore demands the origin

THE CREATIONIST Vol. 1 No. 4 30¢ per copy
Advocates real Genesis Creation and opposes Evolution Published by Christian Evidence League, Box 173, Malverne, N.Y. 11565

of life without divine action upon matter so as to make one or more simple living things, like amoebas, or bacteria, or algae. To make butterflies some descendents would have to alter into worms, and the worms into generalized insects, and those into butterflies. To make man and his alleged ancestors and relatives some worms or other lowly organisms would have to alter into simple fishes, those into lung fishes, those into amphibians like the newt, those into lizards, the lizards into birds and simple warm blooded mammals, and the latter into horses, whales and men!

Note particularly that such alteration of forms would have to occur by natural processes only, which is to say, by natural variation and selection.

No miracle need apply if evolution is to be believed. The Creator could cause a fish egg to hatch into a lizard, and a lizard to give birth to a shrew, or a calf, and so provide the line of descent which evolution needs, but miraculous birth is not evolution. I do not think that any evolutionist of standing would deny this; but when this is understood the problem of creation is half solved.

## IV

Then comes the question: How should the scientist decide what to believe in his examination of the problem of creation? The principle he should follow is very simple, once a person thinks about it.

When the evidence indicates that any great alteration in nature could occur by natural processes only, such processes can well be allowed. But, when any great alteration in nature could seemingly not originate by natural processes, the special exercise of divine power should be allowed.

If this principle could not be used, what method is at all possible in telling whether evolution or special creation should be believed? This principle and these questions are respectfully submitted to the proponents of evolution, but the only defense the evolutionists have is to ignore them.

### Can a Tree Shrew Turn into a Whale?

The theory of organic evolution demands that the descendents of a tree shrew or of some mammal of similar nature alter into whales. If natural selection is capable of accomplishing this, well and good; if not, let us decide that the Creator made the whale.

This principle of deciding between evolution and special creation has to be kept in mind, else reason will have little to do in any decision about creation.

## V

Evolution, as has been pointed out, clearly demands the descent of man, and horse, and whale, and oak, from simple, one-celled ancestors by natural processes only, without miracle. The investigator should under all conditions keep that in mind.

Suppose now that evolution could not accomplish this—and evolution of course cannot do so. Suppose then, that creation was used in making the first men, and horses, and whales, and felines, and oaks, and pines. That is a reasonable belief.

But suppose that *after* the creation of these things some great calamity came upon the earth, or great alterations in climate occurred, or simply that time passed and many different environments existed on the earth so that great changes took place in the descendants of the first men and whales and pine trees.

Under those conditions is the theory of evolution sound science, or is special creation to be believed? This is a question of the utmost importance in this problem of creation.

### Thinking Is Not Reasoning

The biologist sees what he thinks are relationships between different kinds of felines, or oak trees, or other kinds of plants or of animals. In triumph he points to what he says are incontrovertible proofs of evolution. Darwin did just this thing. He saw how different certain reptiles and other animals of the Galapagos Islands were from somewhat similar species elsewhere, and the conviction came upon him, "New species have developed here." Continuing to "reason" about the matter, he developed his theory of the naturalistic origin of species, and from the theory of the origin of species by natural selection he developed the complete theory of the descent of man by natural selection from one-celled organisms!

The problem of creation sadly needs real reason here, for the other kind has always passed to one side in this part of the problem. Suppose that, having some parent turtle species, Galapagos turtles may have come to differ from other turtles, and those other turtles from one another: what had that to do with the descent of turtles from a fish and the fish from an amoeba?

Suppose that thirty, or three hundred different kinds of oak trees are found in different parts of the earth; and that resemblances between different oak species according to location, suggests that they are all descended from an original oak ancestor, does that mean that the original oak descended by natural selection from a fern? Yet time after time this sort of thing is given as a proof of evolution!

### Creationists' Folly

Nor is there less folly in this particular among many creationists, because commonly fixity of species is held to be the keystone in the foundation of the doctrine of direct creation.

Of course much change can be allowed after creation. If any reader will note the curse pronounced upon plant life in the third chapter of Genesis, and agree that a similar curse doubtless came upon the animal creation, he will see that an immense amount of change after creation may have developed, but creation preceded this. Change after creation leaves creation still a fact and evolution not a fact.

Major J. M. Davies, a geologist of Great Britain, and a defender of the Scriptures, asserts that reproduction "after its kind" was for the Edenic earth, and that degeneracy among plants and animals was so great after sin came that the "after its kind" decree was no longer to hold.

Whether this is true or not need not be determined, since both Genesis and biology indicate great changes after creation, but creation came first, then change.

### Three Kinds of Changes Possible

To make the subject clear, three kinds of change are theoretically possible:

(1) The change of origin: to make life where there was no life; to make eyes, and milk glands, and nerves and sex, where there was none of these. Evolution is absolutely helpless in this and creation must be accepted.

(2) To alter radically an organ already in existence; to change the scale of a reptile into the feather of a bird, the fin of a fish into the leg of a newt, the leg of shrew into the wing of a bat, and so on. This is evolution of fundamental alterations, and evolution fails here.

(3) Having birds, and bats, and whales, and horses, and oaks, to accomplish changes of no fundamental importance, though different "species," all of the same general type of the common ancestor might develop.

There are abundant indications that this last kind of change has taken place since creation, but reason has fled from mankind when mankind fights the battle of evolution versus creation on that ground.

## VI

This makes a very interesting question about creation, however. Fixity of species, of a sort, is a common argument for creation, and there is a mixture of error here with truth. An illustration will show how this is.

Felines range from the house cat and its near relatives to the tiger and lion. Between these extremes are the lynx, panther, leopard, and a score or more different feline species. All, however, are felines, or "cats." Similar groupings of species can be made with poppies, oaks, pine trees, sparrows, ducks, bears, and nearly every other form of plant or animal.

### Unnatural Crossings

Taking the felines in particular, each "species" is definite in nature. Individual panthers or tigers differ from one another, but each is recognized at once as panther, tiger, lynx, or other kind of feline. However, tiger will mate with lion and give birth to cubs, which seemingly are fertile.

Other crosses between felines have been accomplished. They are "unnatural" to the extent that they do not occur with wild felines, nor in captivity if a choice of a mate of a similar kind is allowed; nevertheless they take place and give fertile progeny. Here are strong indications of real relationships between animals which differ materially in nature and which will not mate in nature. Creationists agree that these changes have taken place.

The evolutionist goes beyond the point to which creationists will go in asserting relationship.

In botany, for example, he will assert relationship between the Medicago clovers to which creationists should agree, but then he will assert relationship between these and the melilotus clovers; then between the clovers and the peas, beans, lentils and other legumes, until he gets plants that are very far apart.

Now in pure reason there is no "proof" even that tiger and lion are related, or that two clover species of the same genus are related; there are only indications that make such belief reasonable.

Consequently one zoologist might conclude that more animals of a general type were related than another would admit. One botanist would deny probable relationship between two differing clovers while another might assert relationship between all clovers. Neither can prove himself right and the other wrong.

### Relationship without Evolution

Granting this, the feature where reason needs to be applied is this: relationship can exist without "evolution." Perhaps change since creation came about *naturally*. If so, it was not evolution, for evolution must come about through natural processes.

Coming back to our felines, was the descent of lion, tiger, lynx and house cat from some assumed common feline ancestor "evolution," or was it special creation? In other words, does relationship prove evolution? The question can be partly answered by a statement in Douglas Dewar's *Difficulties of the Evolution Theory*, in which he points out that creation could be either by fiat, as independent origin, or by miraculous derivation from some different type of plant or animal. If a shrew were caused to give birth to a bat or a fox, this would be miraculous origin and therefore creation, and yet there would be relationship. Relationship can exist without evolution.

## VII

Granting *some* relationship, the reasoning man should now revert to the cause of such changes as have seemingly taken place.

The fixity of species advocate cites the failure of natural selection, the absence of material variations in progeny, except under abnormal conditions, and the host of other influences which keep wild plants and animals from material alteration as the generations pass. For example, both the lion and tiger, though evidently relatives, as indicated both by resemblances and ability to breed together, continue through all history to be both lion and tiger.

Here then are two seemingly inconsistent conditions: the persistence of type and relationship between two separate species that differ in certain material respects. The evolutionist emphasizes the relationship and runs far beyond in demanding relationship between lion, dog and bear as well, also between lion, mouse and whale, and between whale and lizard, and so on to include everything alive.

The creationist often sees only persistence of type and denies probable relationship that the zoologists and botanists have good reason to assert. If he does this he takes a false position, just as the evolutionists take a false position in demanding natural relationship between whale and lion. The condition confronting us is relationship and persistence of type. The question is:

### What Is the Solution?

The answer would seem to be *change since creation through the intervention of the Creator*. The lion and the house cat are seemingly related. The original feline ancestor was created. Perhaps the change from such ancestor to both lion and house cat came by some natural processes which we do not understand, but the testimony of the science of genetics which shows persistence of type, at least strongly suggests that the alteration came by the direct intervention of the Creator.

Whether this is the case, or whether the change came by natural variation, is not a matter of very great importance and there is, in fact, no way that the matter can be determined.

But, if the change came by divine intervention the extreme creationist is right in saying that each species, using the term in its narrowest meaning, is after all a product of creation, while the evolutionist is evidently right in asserting that much relationship exists between what are now very distinct species, though he is wrong in asserting that these changes came by evolution.

If they came by the intervention of divine power, they came by creation. The Creator may have made the first whales through birth from shrews, or seals, or otters, and thus given relationship, but it would be a miraculous origin and so creation. More probably He made each of these independently and outright.

### What the Biologist Must Admit

The biologist in trying to account for the differences between species has therefore two things to allow: first, such extreme differences exist that independent creation ought to be allowed; secondly, very apparent relationships exist which may have developed naturally and may have come by divine fiat, though the relationship is there without much question.

This is an important point and one upon which reason is broken in reaching conclusions about both creation and evolution. The evolutionist sees only evidence of relationship and ignores the difficulty of getting such relationship with the help of a Creator; then, seeing some relationship he wants everything to be related. As a scientist of national note said to me once: "If species are related in a genus, why should not genera in a family be related? And if genera in a family are related, why should not classes and orders be related until a complete system of relationships develops?" He did not seem to realize the difference in relationship between lion and house cat and lion and whale, but this has been mentioned before.

## VIII

Now, as far as the biologist who makes a careful study of different forms of life is concerned, the question about how far relationships can extend is an interesting one, but it is something that the layman has no right to decide. The layman sees the difference between horse and cow, and rightly decides that they are distinct "creations." If he made some careful investigations in other lines he might, however, find some very puzzling conditions.

### A Layman's Puzzle

He sees a great difference between cow (or using the generic term, ox) and goat, but if he would place side by side the oxen of different types, the bison, the buffalo (the bison is not a buffalo), the musk ox, the various wild goats, and sheep, and antelopes, and deer and other horned animals, he would be puzzled to decide where lines of relationship could be drawn.

Similar difficulties would be encountered with rodents and other groups of mammals; also with reptiles, fishes, insects, plants, and all living things.

Yet in all, two facts would be outstanding: great gaps exist both in theory and fact between plants and between animals of greatly differing form; and no agency for accomplishing much change after creation exists except the act of the Creator.

After all, those two things taken together are the insurmountable obstacles which evolutionists cannot face and do not try to face. In helplessness they ignore them and discredit their professed science by so doing. When the layman keeps these two things in mind he will understand the great features of the problem of creation.

Certain creationists wish to make ability to interbreed the measure of relationship but even there they have no trustworthy guide. The lion and the tiger will breed, the cat and the lynx will not but yet they are evidently related. The horse and the ass will breed, but the progeny will be a mule, an almost sterile animal.

They deny relationship between the horse and the ass on account of the almost complete sterility of the mule, yet if they were familiar with the way hybrid walnuts, berries, grapes and other plants have all degrees between fertility and sterility, they would have to surrender the sterility measure of species relationships.

If the Creator allowed much change after creation there is no reason to believe that He would not allow some of those changes to pass the sterility limits. That He certainly created is after all the important fact that has to be allowed; the amount of change since creation is a problem of very minor importance.

---

*from page 92*

I hope truthfully, that it is the shortest river on earth and also has the greatest fall of any river on earth before its bed flattens out.

Now let us go to Southern California which is radically different geologically from the rest of the state. The far larger part of the area is occupied by sedimentary rocks that mostly are classified as being very recent, and they mostly seem to extend very far below sea level. Fifteen to 20,000 feet is rather deep for sea floor, though deep submarine canyons have floors 5000 feet or so deeper than typical ocean floor, and narrow deep trenches exist in a few places to depths of 35,000 or so feet below sea level. Yet along the coast of Ventura County where there has been testing of depths of formations that have promise of petroleum 'sediments' exist to a depth of 35,000 feet, about 2½ times as far below sea level as the top of Mt. Whitney rises above sea level. Also, one of the main sedimentary formations of Southern California is classified as being only 500,000 years old, although the supposed first part of an ice age that came to the Far North is said to have started 600,000 years ago.*

In fact, indicating a near-uniqueness for this area, the Pacific Northwest lava flows, extending from Northern California as far as the British Columbia line in places, with an arm running far into Idaho, is one of the two largest lava flows in the world, occupying an area of about 200,000 square miles. The Dekkan lava flow in south India, however, is thought to contain about four times as much lava as this area. There must have been a tremendous disturbance of the crust of the earth at that time.

Obviously we should be able to say that things like these could not occur

*-continued page 84*

*From *The Crust of the Earth*, prepared through the Lamont Geophysical Laboratory, under the direction of the Geological Society of America, 1956.

*The Geological "Ages" Theory,*

# The FETISH of The Evolutionists

By GEORGE Mc CREADY PRICE

MOST sacred of all the sacred cows, in the eyes of the evolutionists, is the theory of the long geological "ages," marked off by the differential dating of the fossils. Characteristic of each of the successive "ages" are certain kinds of fossils, termed "index fossils." And the long geological "ages" are classified into a definite succession by the kinds of fossils they contain.

As it works out in actual practice, a geologist might be blindfolded and taken out to an entirely new region, and if he found certain kinds of shell fish, or the bones of certain reptiles, or the teeth of a mastodon, he would without hesitation give the "age" of the rocks in which they had been found. It makes no difference whether the rocks are hard or soft, black shale or white limestone, neither does it make any difference what kinds of beds are above or below. When the "index" fossils are found, that settles the matter.

The theory of evolution is, and always has been, far more dependent upon this theory of the fossils having lived in a definite sequence, than on any other idea, almost more than on all other ideas combined. And today, when, as the late John Burroughs declared, Darwin has been shorn of his selection theories as completely as Samson was shorn of his locks, the main theory of evolution still stands strongly entrenched in the minds of hundreds of millions, due almost wholly to the supposed ability of geologists to differentially date the rocks according to the fossils they contain.

The essential idea about the geological "ages" is not their great length, for that is always considered very indefinite, very elastic. The prime idea is the exact serial order in which they follow one another, and this exactness of serial sequence is derived wholly from the theories about the fossils.

The theory of the geological "ages" does not have any other foundation than the supposed differential dating of the fossils, *and never did have.* Professedly based on the infallible record of nature's own diary engraved in the rocks, these geological "ages" are simply the *devil's counterfeit of the six days of creation.* They are just an *anti-Genesis,* and the cleverest trick the devil could invent to counterfeit the record of a creation in six literal days. This has always been their essential nature, and always will be.

Anyone who has read my books attentively knows that my indictment of geological theories has been very largely directed against this evolutionary succession of the fossils. I have never denied that in many localities a definite sequence can be shown which is somewhat similar to the sequence in various other places. But I have always denied that this sequence holds all over the globe, and I have shown that other sequences are known in hundreds and even thousands of places. And I have supported these assertions by facts and arguments which have never been traversed or denied by any one.

Now some of the popularizers of modern science have been reading up in the standard geological literature and have discovered that universally the geologists affirm this regular sequence of the fossils. And these writers ask:

Are these men not to be trusted? Are not these eminent scientific men perfectly honorable and truthful, and are they not accurate in reporting what they have found in the field, here and there and all over? And why should we not accept their conclusion? Then is it not clear that we must adapt our interpretation of the Bible to conform to the geological "day-age" theory?

But let us now see how many great systems or sets of rocks are recognized by geologists.

*Sixteen*, if the two subdivisions of such groups as the Carboniferous are treated as of major rank, and if the three or four subdivisions of the Tertiary are also to be counted. They are to be read from the bottom upward, which is the true historical order, in the minds of geologists. And the total of these systems, or the total "geological column," as it is called, is estimated at about 500,000 feet, or let us say one hundred miles.

But is any such enormous thickness of fossil-bearing strata ever found in any one locality?

Of course not. A maximum of about three miles has been found in a few places; but the great majority of places around over the world have less than half of even this thickness, while over wide stretches of every continent the stratified beds are less than a mile in thickness.

Then how is the grand total of a hundred miles obtained?

That is very easy. It is computed in the library or the museum. The maximum for each "type locality" is added to all the others, and thus the total for the world is just a matter of simple arithmetic. And it is always the sequence of the fossils in this grand total which geologists have in mind when they speak about the invariable sequence of the fossils. Also it is on this total as an outline, as a sort of historical spinal column or backbone, that the flesh and blood of the evolutionary theory has been constructed through the years.

I have never thought of denying that geologists frequently employ several objective or common-sense methods in tracing "equivalent" strata from one locality to another. Nor have I ever tried to evade the fact that in many places Paleozoic beds do occur below Mesozoic, and that in other places Mesozoic are found below Tertiary ones. But out of the sixteen systems mentioned above as composing the grand total of one hundred miles, it is seldom the case that more than *three* or *four* of them ever occur in one locality; usually only about *one* thick set is present or is well represented, the other two or three are present only as thin samples. In many localities we find only one of these sixteen systems, with it resting on the bottom or the primitive, as if it were just as old as any other elsewhere. And *frequently it may be number six or number ten, or even number twelve or number sixteen which is thus at the bottom, and occupies the entire beds to the top or the surface of the ground.*

Again, in scores or even hundreds of instances, one of the younger beds, let us say number twelve, is found directly upon one very much older, let us say number six or number ten, *with all the others missing*, though the two sets of beds are strictly *conformable*, and every physical evidence would indicate that the two beds must have followed one another in quick succession. Such examples are known among geologists as "deceptive conformities," meaning that the physical evidence is not to be trusted, for the fossil evidence proves them to be many "ages" apart.

Thus these numerous instances where "young" beds occur on the bottom covering wide areas, and the many examples of "deceptive conformities," with great blocks entirely missing, would seem to prove to any unbiased mind that the fossils cannot truthfully be said to occur always in the same relative order in all parts of the world.

Would it not be safe to say from merely these lines of evidence, that a very considerable amount of theory must be employed in assembling beds from distant localities, and constructing them into this formidable total of a hundred miles?

It has proved impossible to trace the physical continuity of beds across any large mountain range. All stratified beds are *lenticular*, and thin out at the edges

and disappear when traced any considerable distance, being replaced by others, or often interfingering with others. These stratigraphic details are often used in tracing one set of beds across a country, but always the fossils are treated as the supreme court of appeal, and no decision is allowed to stand which is contrary to the fossil evidence.

And how are these precious "index fossils" selected? For a full century now, the guiding star in all this work has been the noted (or *notorious*, if you prefer) "law of comparison," enunciated by Louis Agassiz, then little more than a boy, by which the geological sequence of any of the classes of animals—fishes, gastropods, trilobites, shell fish, etc., is to be established by comparison with the embryonic development of a modern individual of this class.

In that early day, slightly over a century ago, the geologists were anxiously looking for some key whereby the fossils from distant deposits could be arranged in their "true" historical order; and this hint of the brilliant young Swiss was eagerly accepted as solving the difficulty. It was only very much later that the results of this method were turned completely around, and made into Ernst Hæckel's recapitulation theory.

But at the time I am referring to, in the middle thirties of the nineteenth century, the students of the rocks and the fossils joyfully accepted the key given by Agassiz; so that from that time forward the final decision concerning the geological date of any deposit in China, in Alaska, in Patagonia, or in Tibet, was largely taken out of the hands of the field men, and rested with the paleontologists in their museums.

We can now answer the question raised above, How are these "guide fossils," or "index fossils," selected from the multiplied thousands of others, these others being considered unreliable or ambiguous in this matter of telling us the age of a set of beds? *They are selected by the paleontologists in the museums.* And of course, sooner or later some field man will be able to discover some sequence here or there which will correspond with the rules established by the men at the museum, thus establishing a "type locality," to which all subsequent investigators can be pointed, as the visible example of the true geological sequence for the particular fossil animals dealt with.

And from the establishment of this method dates the custom, now so universally followed, of the field worker boxing up some of the best specimens he has found, and sending them to headquarters, to be passed upon by the judges there located. And in case of any serious difficulty in settling on the exact "age" of a set of beds by this method, there is always the standing committee on such questions at the Washington Geological Survey, which has been in continuous session for some three quarters of a century.

And then to complete the beautiful circle of reasoning and of deceiving the public, the modern evolutionists "prove" that their theory of organic development repeats or recapitulates the geological history as found in the rocks. As in the old Hindoo fable, the serpent is eternally chasing its tail.

The plain unvarnished fact is that this entire subject of classifying the fossils into successive "ages" for the world as a whole is rotten with artificiality and subjectivity. No method of correlating the strata on opposite sides of an ocean or even a mountain range, or any two widely distant localities, has ever been suggested by anyone anywhere or at any time, except by means of the scheme of "index fossils."

But with the fossils alone determining the "age" of every set of beds, one might suppose that occasionally beds might be found occurring in the exact reverse of the standard order. Have any such instances been discovered?

Plenty of them. They are found in all parts of the world which have been well explored geologically. But with the settled conviction strong in their souls as to the sequence in which the rocks (or fossils) *must* have been deposited in the long ago, geologists have always, sooner or later, been able to invent a method of explaining away the perplexing evidence.

Examples of this sort were discovered in the Alps about three quarters of a century ago; and since then they have been reported in a steady stream from all parts of the world. Such instances are

now usually called "low-angle faults," or "Thrust faults;" for the theory is that the "old" rocks on top of "younger" must have been pushed there by some mechanical force, and the two sets of beds are usually so horizontal over miles and miles of territory, and look so perfectly like any normal stratigraphic sequence, that drastic theoretical suppositions have to be imagined to "explain" the situation. For, as Albert Heim of the University of Geneva wrote to me forty years ago, geologists are firmly convinced that "the most incredible mechanical explanation is more probable than that the evolution of organic nature should have been inverted in one country as compared with another."

Nobody has ever explained the mechanical method by which a comparatively thin set of rocks could be pushed across a tract of country for a score or more of miles, the push coming from behind at a distance of this many miles away. Where and how could such a force be applied?

In summary of the foregoing, the fact needs to be stressed that the theory of geological "ages," founded entirely on the differential dating of the fossils, is not only the most sacred of all the sacred cows of the evolutionists, but it is also plainly and positively *an anti-Genesis*. This anti-Genesis character of the idea may be proved in three ways: (a) by the history of the beginning of the theory under Baron Cuvier and Louis Agassiz; (b) by the logic of the case, when these geological "ages" are compared with the six days of the first chapter of Genesis; and (c) by the entire subsequent history of the way in which these "ages" have ever since been used to "prove" that the days of creation were long periods of time.

The plain fact is that there are certain wide areas of scientific research on which the great Jehovah has long maintained a notice reading, NO TRESPASSING! One of these areas takes in the entire subject of origins. The divine record is that when God had completed the work of creation, He ceased, or rested, as a lawyer rests his case when it is finished. Then the Creator established the Sabbath as an everlasting memorial of the fact that God's creation is an absolutely finished work, and that nothing like it is now going on. Accordingly, we have this divine reason why scientists cannot, by any objective study of the present conditions of nature and of them alone, obtain any clue as to how creation itself was accomplished.

**OUR TIMES, NOVEMBER, 1948**

---


**Problems and Methods in Geology** by George McCready Price. Studies in Stratigraphic Geology, Methodology in Historical Geology, and The New Deluvialism in relation to evolution, creation and the deluge. **$1.00**

**FEET OF CLAY: The Unscientific Nonsense of Historical Geology**
by George McCready Price
The Case Against the geological ages. ..... **25c**

**WERE THE FOSSILS CONTEMPORARY?**
by George McCready Price
The critical Time-element in the discussion of evolution, geology and the Bible. ..... **25c**

**AFTER ITS KIND by Byron C. Nelson**
A convincing dissertation of the fallacy of the theory of organic evolution. ~~$2.50~~
Code 10-100

**THE DELUGE STORY IN STONE**
**by Byron C. Nelson**
Evidence from the sciences to substantiate the Bible story of the Deluge. ~~$2.50~~
Code 10-925

DID YOU MISS THESE?

Case For Creation 4004 B.C.
Amazing Credulity of the Evolutionist
Two Men Named Charles
Origin of Nations
Christian Manifesto Concerning Evolution

You missed them all if you missed CREATIONIST No. 1. Order one now 30¢

# The Case for
# Creation 4,004 B.C.
## A Challenge to Debate

By Dudley Joseph Whitney
Exeter, California

(Continued from page 55)

### DELUGE GEOLOGY VERSUS AGES GEOLOGY

The geologists assert that the earth is many millions of years old and that it has gone through a series of geologic ages. Their case for ages geology is based primarily upon two propositions: (1) that the sedimentary rocks of the past were laid down slowly, by processes such as operate now; and (2) that there is a definite sequence to the fossils: that is, that for a long period of time there was no life on earth, or only very simple forms of life; then there was an Age of Invertebrates, an Age of Fishes, an Age of Amphibians and Coal Plants, and so on.

Both of these beliefs are contrary to fact. On the first proposition geologists now admit much flood action in the deposit of sediments and the burial of fossils. Thus Arthur Holmes in the Age of the Earth (1937) p. 83, says regarding the burial of fossils: "Individual beds may have been deposited very rapidly, as indeed they must have been to ensure the burial and preservation of large fossils." Thus mud and water would have to move in extraordinary amount and violence to bury a group of great dinosaurs so that they would be preserved as fossils, and the same thing is true of a bed of salt water fishes, or of fresh water fishes, for that matter. Even many coal beds are admittedly due to vegetation having been washed into place instead of growing where the coal is found. Surely it would be more reasonable to accept belief in one great Deluge rather than a series of deluges occurring through millions of years.

Secondly, there is no true order to the fossils; time after time formations said to be very old overlie rather than underlie others formations said to be much younger, which is like having the upper courses of a stone wall laid before the courses upon which they rest. That is absurd. Every geologist admits numerous cases of formations of the so-called geologic ages existing in the reverse order for those ages, and no geologist can offers any plausible explanation of the mechanics by which the upper and alleged older rocks could be shoved over on the underlying and presumably younger rocks. These conditions were pointed out

many years ago by Prof. Price. The geologists have been indignant at this, but they cannot deny that the conditions exist nor explain them away.

However, there are also other good reasons for asserting the merits of Deluge action over the geologic ages in the laying down of the sediments.

Many instances occur where thicknesses of water-formed rocks rise several miles above sea level, so what is now mountain top was below sea level before the uplift, and the sediments now at the base of the mountains were many thousands of feet below sea level when the uplift began. They were even deeper than the average depth of the ocean, a thing that seems extraordinary. Also, as was pointed out earlier, this uplift was recent, evidently taking place at about the time Ussher gave for the Deluge.

These great thicknesses of sedimentary rocks are inexplicable on a globe which is as rigid as a ball of steel, but it is not inexplicable by Deluge theory, by which much of the crust of the earth would be broken up in water and then uplifted to make the present lands.

Also, wells have been drilled for oil to a depth of more than three miles before striking crystaline rock. All above that was rock which was laid down in water: shales, limestones, sandstones, sheets of gypsum and anhydrite and so on. That is, these sediments were laid down to a greater depth than most ocean floor, and they were laid down well within the borders of the continental mass *where no deep water had any right to be in a sound system of ages geology.*

The explanation geologists give for these deep sediments where oil wells have been drilled, or where a great series of coal beds are located, is that the sediments were laid down in shallow inland seas. (Note the term 'shallow.') The inland sea floors would have to sink as sediments formed on them until the original floor had reached a depth greater than that of most of the ocean. The whole idea is ridiculous.

Consider too the great thickness of the coal measures. Arthur Holmes in the Age of the Earth gives the thickness of the Carboniferous rocks in both Britain and the U. S. A. as 40,000 feet, a thickness of more than seven miles. He gives the thickness of the Cretaceous system in the western U. S. A. (where most western coal is found) as 64,000 feet. Now this does not necessarily mean that the lowermost Carboniferous or Cretaceous rock was 40,000 feet, or 64,000 feet, nearer the center of the earth when the uppermost sediment was laid down, than it is now, but it must mean that it was thousands of feet lower down—and on a globe composed of iron and stony material? The thing will simply not stand the touchstone of common sense.

Not only the thickness of the systems of coal bearing rock, but their nature show that ages geology is bad science. See, for example, what would have to happen by ages geology to bring into being a great series of coal beds, for most coal beds were laid down one over another, with earthy material between them, for a thickness of many thousands of feet.

For the first formed, lowermost, bed, a great expanse of coal vegetation would have to form in some way on flat land; then the land would have to sink below sea level without the vegetation being washed away and sediment would be deposited upon it, building it up to sea level so that a new lot of vegetation could accumulate, and the process would have to be repeated time after time until a great series of coal beds had formed, one upon another. There would have to be sinking for thousands of feet (on a rigid globe), and the sinking would be mostly in the sea, because marine fossils are found frequently between coal beds, and the sinking would have to be deeper than most sea floor. The idea of the thing is ridiculous.

Admittedly Deluge geologists are also unable to explain the formation of coal beds on a purely natural basis either, but they are better off than the age geologists in one critical feature, and that is, much coal vegetation was admittedly formed by being washed into place, and this is flood action, not the operation of common geologic processes.

Now study limestone formations. Sometimes these are massive, or unstratified, and at other times strongly stratified. Ages geology can account for neither kind. Stratification indicates flood action, favoring Deluge geology. Calcium carbonate would not be laid down in deltas plentifully enough to form limestone; it would be so mixed with silt that the result would be a shale, not a limestone.

That kind of limestone called dolomite is particularly important in connection with the problem of its origin, since it is rich in magnesium carbonate as well as calcium carbonate. This does not settle out on sea floor nor form naturally elsewhere except under unique conditions and in small quantities. The only reasonable way to account for it in the abundance and condition in which it occurs is to decide that it was in the earth's crust before the Deluge and that it was broken up, redeposited and then unlifted.

The same thing is emphatically true with gypsum and anhydrite, which are composed of calcium sulphate, combined with water in the case of gypsum and uncombined in anhydrite. This does not settle out of ocean or river water now, except under very unique conditions, or in traces. These materials in the great beds in which they are often found can only be accounted for on the basis that they were in the crust of the antediluvian earth.

One feature about them is worthy of special mention. Often sheets of the materials are penetrated in drilling oil wells, and most such sheets are now below sea level, and presumably they were below sea level when they were laid down. It is out of order to suppose that they could have been precipitated on ancient sea floors. One place shows this conclusively. That is Florida, where wells have been drilled to a depth of more than 11,000 feet, penetrating a number of strata of gypsum and anhydrite. Do not tell us, geology experts, that mountains once rose well beyond the edge of the continental mass to make the area where Florida stands an inland sea in which limestones and

other marine rocks of that land were laid down.

Sand stones imply the rapid movement of water, not gradual processes; otherwise clay and other finely divided material would be so abundant that the result would not be a typical sandstone.

Conglomerates, containing gravel and water rounded stones, certainly imply flood action, not gradual processes, and this calls for definite notice. These round rocks found so often along stream beds, on pebbley beaches, mixed with the soil in narrow valleys, and often in great quantities elsewhere, surely were formed and moved by moving water. They are *not being formed now,* save to an insignificant extent. They are being worn away many times faster than they are being formed, and this demands an answer to the question, How did they come into being? The only good answer is, by Deluge action.

The source of each rounded stone must have been in massive rock, either along the shore or in the mountains and hills, along the streams—or in the antediluvian earth. But along the shore waves will not break massive rock into pieces and wear the pieces into round stones, and rocks from hillsides which fall into streams will be worn into sand and dissolved material before they get far along stream beds. Such stones are being destroyed many times faster than they are being produced.

The rounded rocks along pebbley beaches were buried in the ground when the land was uplifted and exposed where the loose material in which they were buried was worn away, and the rounded stones of stream bed were mostly left there when the land was uplifted, or exposed by the wearing away of banks in which they were buried. Geologists cannot explain successfully the numerous instances of rounded rocks in hillsides, or mixed with the finer material of many small valleys.

Deluge geology has an obvious explanation. When much of the crust of the antediluvian earth was broken up in water at the time of the outbreak of the Deluge great amounts of broken rock were moved around and rough edges worn off and they were buried in the lands or, in many instances, left upon the surface of the ground. There can be no other logical way to explain the existence of rounded stones here and there over most of the land where there is no evidence of stream flow, or buried in such land. This is one of the most obvious things in geology, and one of the most ignored; possibly because it is so obvious and partly because the implications contradict orthodox geologic theories so plainly. And this brings us to one of the most important problems in geology:

## THE GLACIAL NIGHTMARE AND THE DELUGE

This expression had its origin in the title of a book by a noted British geologist of half a century or more ago, Sir Henry Howorth. It introduces here the issue whether what is called glacial drift came by ice or in some other way. The thesis set forth here is that it came by watery disturbance incidental to the uplift of the land, not by the action of an ice sheet, and not by floating ice either. The geologists saw these rock wastes at the

surface of the land and because they bore *some* resemblance to the rock wastes laid down by alpine glaciers, and because they had no other way, so they thought, to explain them, they decided that they were laid down by great ice sheets which extended far from mountains and down in temperate regions where ice sheets had no right to be by any sane system of climatology.

Admittedly, however, the land in these places had been uplifted from below sea level. Surely too it should be admitted that in the uplift of the land, whatever the history of the globe had been there would be much aqueous disturbance incidental to that uplift, and loose rock would be left at the surface. The issue should have been seen and faced whether this rock came by such aqueous disturbance or by the action of moving ice. This issue is to be discussed here. Surely it is a legitimate issue.

In the issue of an ice age or no ice age, immediately preceding the present, here is a condition that should be explained. The stratified rocks by any kind of history that is adopted show that the plants and animals which lived just before the present age (or before the ice age, if it occurred) were different in many ways from the plants and animals today. Elephants, rhinoceroses, camels and many other kinds of beasts lived over much of the earth where they are now extinct, including Alaska and Siberia. Plants of the warm temperate regions grew in the far north. Then they disappeared and after their disappearance great land changes occurred.

The question now is vital: Was there an ice age following this warm, flourishing so-called Tertiary period, or did this end suddenly and not long ago, leaving the world with approximately its present climates?

Geologists, confronted with this problem and having committed themselves to the theory of ages, adopted the theory of a series of ice epochs preceding the present time, during which an ice cap covered much of Europe and another covered much of North America, extending well down into what is now the United States. They did this to account for the so-called glacial drift which they found here and there. Until they weigh the evidence for aqueous disturbance as against the ice age theory, they have no right to assert the truth of the latter. And with that for an introduction we can proceed with an examination of the subject.

One of the first things to say is that glaciers exist, anywhere on earth, except near the south pole, only at high elevations or in ice streams running from mountain glaciers. In Antarctica much of the low lying lands have no permanent ice, and even in the high mountains of northern Alaska snow exists only in patches during the summer.

Since ice and snow do not endure through the summers on low lands in such cold areas as the northern parts of Asia and North America, it seems inexcusable to assert that extensive low lying lands far down in temperate regions were covered with

great ice sheets in the not so distant past. That is bad science.

The great Greenland ice sheet, the only great ice sheet on earth except that on the Antarctic continent, has been studied carefully durng the last few decades and surface melting on that sheet, in summer, in spite of its elevation and its location far in the north is astonishingly great. Down in southern Canada and the northern United States, if there was once a great ice sheet, the melting would be far greater than it is on the Greenland sheet, far beyond what would be renewed by precipitation in the colder months. The assertion that there was once a great ice sheet down in that area therefore seems inexcusable. The same thing is true for central Europe, South Africa, Australia and other places where ice caps had no right to be.

It can also be said, without contradiction, that the rock debris from the Greenland ice does not make the kind of deposits found in southern Canada, the northern United States and other places named. Considering these facts the ice age hypothesis should either be defended successfully or openly discarded as bad science. I challenge any geologist to defend the ice age hypothesis against the evidence I have given against it.

Eliminate this theory and we have these features: the recent elevation of the land; an enormous thickness of sediment covering much of the land; signs of great aqueous disturbance in the laying down of this sediment, including rounded stones at the surface; and the world-wide traditions of the Deluge. They all point directly against ages geology and toward Deluge geology and the recent creation of the earth.

Mr. Whitney will conclude this paper in the next issue of THE CREATIONISTwith a discussion of the age of the ocean and other matters including radioactivity estimates.

---

*--from page 74*

on an earth that is even several hundred thousand, or a million, or billions of years old, as the earth is said to be; and yet geologists have been teaching for several decades that the earth had clear skies over a world wide ocean something like 4,500 million years ago.

Two great reasons for objecting to a great age for the earth are: too much evidence for one great, recent remaking of the face of the face of the earth as the source of the sedimentary rocks and the fossils that they contain, and the nature of volcanic activity, and the immense amount of that activity that has been occurring in the last century or so.

A firecracker can be exploded only once. So also, since a great outburst of volcanic activity here and there over many lands, could occur only once. All steam and other hot gases held in the earth's crust might not escape to the surface for many centuries, but one great volcanic outbreak in the crust of the earth is all that could be expected. That seems to have taken place only a few centuries earlier than four thousand years ago, when present lands seem to have been raised above sea level. ⊠⊠

## Noted Chemist Supports Creation View

Henry Eyring, Ph.D. (right), president-elect of the American Chemical Society, who recently visited the campuses of Loma Linda University and La Sierra College, converses with Dr. William D. Leech in the latter's laboratory at Loma Linda University. In an address to the student assembly on the University campus the distinguished chemist, also professor of chemistry and dean of the Graduate School at the University of Utah, explained that all living things on earth are composed in the same way, with amino acids serving as the building blocks from which the protein molecules are assembled. An authority in his field, he spoke out clearly in support of the creationist view.

"In this world everybody—white or black, Democrat, Republican, or Communist—is made of an identical chemical substance," said Dr. Eyring. "The only explanation for this is that the Lord, however He made the world—and He really did make it—chose to make everything from exactly the same basic material. We live in a world of design, which convinces me that there is a Designer who planned the whole thing, like a symphony which plays the same theme over and over again in different ways."

WILLIAM D. LEECH, Ph.D.
*Professor of Chemistry*
*Loma Linda University*
*Graduate School*

REVIEW AND HERALD, September 6, 1962

*Reprinted by permission*


DID YOU MISS THESE?

Is Evolution a Demonstrated Fact?

Case for Creation 4004 B.C.

Evidence of Embryology

Why a Christian Cannot be an Evolitionist

What About Evolution?

What Are the Oldest and Youngest Fossils?

You missed them all if you missed THE CREATIONIST No. 3. Order your copy Now, 30¢

# HE DAYS

## *Solar Days or Millenniums*

BECAUSE of the simple, plainly expressed, straightforward quality of the narrative of Genesis 1, apparently no question regarding the length of the days of creation week arose in the minds of those who read it prior to the time of the early geologists. These geologists, however, accepted the principle of uniformity and concluded that the earth must be millions of years old. As this idea began to spread, it was claimed that an almost unlimited amount of time was needed to account for such phenomena as the Grand Canyon of the Colorado and the remnants of various mountain ranges which apparently had been worn down by processes of erosion. This demand for vast stretches of time was greatly strengthened by the acceptance of the idea of evolution which Charles Darwin set forth. Millions upon millions of years were required by his theory in order, supposedly, to give time for the simple to evolve into the complex.

Furthermore, shortly before the middle of the nineteenth century the English physicist, John Tyndall (1820-1893), argued that the fossils embedded in the rocks gave every indication of great age rather than of the comparatively short existence they would actually have if formed from created organisms as Genesis stated. He said, "If God made these in an instant of time, He has perpetrated a lie upon the human race." He objected that God could not have created an age-old fossil in an instant of time. This argument caught the attention of many who did not believe in miracles. Thus it was that the day-age theory sprang from an effort on the part of those who still wished to accept the Bible, to harmonize Genesis with the concept that present-day forms have evolved through vast periods of geological time. The days of Genesis were each assumed to constitute a period of such time.

With regard to the length of a geological period, Schuchert and Dunbar[3] say, "The periods as now defined vary in length from about 20 to 40 million years each, the two largest ones being the Cambrian and Ordovician; but when the principles of diastrophism and organic evolution are fully applied, ten, instead of seven, periods will be recognized in the Paleozoic, and the length of these will be between 20 and 45 million years each."

Actually, the idea that *yom* (day) means a period of time longer than twenty-four hours finds no substantiation in reputable Hebrew dictionaries such as those of Buhl,[2] Brown, Driver, Briggs,[3] and Koenig.[4] Skinner[6] remarks, "The interpretation of *yom* as aeon, a favorite resource of harmonists

# OF CREATION

## *of Geological Time?* *by* FRANK L. MARSH

of science and revelation, is opposed to the plain sense of the passage and has no warrant in Hebrew usage." Dillmann[6] says: "The reasons advanced by ancient and modern writers for construing these days to be longer periods of time are inadequate."

It is well to bear in mind that in Genesis 1:5 the Hebrew word *yom* (day) is used in two different senses. "Day" (*yom*) when used with night (*láyela*) must refer to the light part of the day, roughly, twelve hours. When the statement is made that the "day" is ended, the same word is used to mean a twenty-four-hour period. In Genesis 2:4, *yom* is used in such a way as to embrace all the "yoms" of the first chapter. Furthermore, as pointed out by Rimmer,[7] the word *yom* is translated in the authorized English edition of the Bible "1,181 times as 'day,' 67 times as 'time,' 30 times as 'today,' 18 times as 'forever,' 10 times as 'continually,' 6 times as 'age,' 4 times as 'life,' and 2 times as 'perpetually.'" In the light of these many uses of *yom* it is argued by day-age theorists that there is no way of telling from the context how long a period of time is indicated. However, a careful study of the statements of Genesis 1 leaves no grounds for such a conclusion. In fact, the context is the key to the length of duration to which reference is being made when the days of creation week are described.

At least nine good reasons exist for concluding that the days of creation week were literal, twenty-four-hour days. These reasons are as follows:

1. *Testimony of reputable authorities.* This is the point to which we referred in a previous paragraph. Hebrew dictionaries are our primary source of reliable information concerning Hebrew words. These sources know nothing of the notion that *yom* means an indefinite period. Commentators with critical leanings utter decided statements to the effect that *yom*, when used to refer to one of the periods of creation week, can mean only a twenty-four-hour day.

2. *Use of "yom" when accompanied by a definite number serving as an adjective.* In the Hebrew manuscripts, in every instance in which *yom* is accompanied by a definite number, a solar day is indicated. Without fail we have the second *yom* of the feast, the third *yom* of the journey, the seventh *yom* of the week, the seventeenth *yom* of the month, etc., etc. Applying this fact to the days of creation week, we note that a definite number is used with each of these periods from one to seven inclusively. This leaves us with only one valid conclusion: These days were twenty-four hour, solar days.

3. *Instantaneity of accomplishment.* The very wording of the narrative indi-

cates a shortness of time involved. To illustrate, in Genesis 1:11 the command is *Dashá,* which literaliy says, "Earth, sprout sprouts!" And verse 12 records the prompt response to the command; the earth caused the plants to "go out" *(yatsá).* There is nothing in any part of the record which would in any way indicate that aeons or periods of time are involved. The phraseology of the record for each day indicates an instantaneous action.

4. *Each day a period of light and darkness.* It is impossible to reconcile the fact that each period of creation week was divided into a dark portion and a light portion, with the idea that each of these periods was millions of years in length. This designation of the days is in exact conformity with the method of recording time in the Mosaic period. Evening and morning constituted one tweny-four-hour period.

5. *Plants and the dark period.* It is recorded of the third day, as of the other days, "Evening came and morning came, making the third day." Genesis 1:13, Moffatt. Upon this day all kinds of plants appeared, the flowering, seed-bearing sorts, as well as the simpler forms. If this "day" were a period ol geological time, all plants would have perished during those millions of years of darkness before the light of the fourth "day" dawned. Again, the only valid conclusion is that this day, as the others, was one solar day.

6. *Interdependence of plants and animals.* According to the statements of Genesis 1, plants, including flowering kinds, were created on the third day, while no animal was formed until the fifth day. The interdependence of plants and animals is a conspicuous fact in the world of living things. To illustrate, in the matter of pollination alone, multitudes of plants could not carry on from generation to generation without insects. Yet the record states that seed-bearing plants were successful from the very start. This could not be the case if insects did not appear until some twenty million to forty million years later, as would be the case if the days were geological periods.

7. *The Sabbath not a geological period.* In the fourth commandment we read, "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it." If we assume that the days of creation week were geological periods, then, to be consistent, we must likewise assume that the day of rest was a period of millions of years. But in that case God is still resting, because Bible chronology shows that about six thousand years have elapsed since the creation of Adam. If God is still in His seventh day, and resting, then it is difficult to explain the statement that Jesus made, "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to finish His work."

8. *Geological time and the age of Adam.* If these days were geological periods, then man was created in the sixth such division. According to the story of Genesis, Adam was created on the sixth day. Even if he had sinned and died as early as Sunday, he still would have lived through one entire period and parts of two others. This would require that he live at least twenty million years. The record of Genesis 5:5 states that Adam lived 930 years.

9. *The Sabbath command.* As we have already noted, the wording of the fourth commandment (Exodus 20:11) can be harmonized with creation week only when the days of that week are considered as solar days. The fourth command states in clear language, "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day." This is the statement of the Creator Himself, and in these words there is not the slightest evidence that the days of

creation week were other than twenty-four-hour periods. The Creator's reason for asking man to keep the seventh solar day holy is the fact that He created all things in six solar days. In this commandment the Creator specifies what shall be done on the first six literal days of the week, and then what shall not be done on the seventh. Six twenty-four-hour days, followed by another twenty-four-hour day of rest, alone can furnish a consistent analogy for our working six days and resting on the seventh day. The beauty and forcefulness of this reason appears when we understand that the days of creation week were literal.

Thus it becomes evident that the simple, clearly worded story of Genesis 1 tells in unmistakable words that creation week was a week of seven solar days, as every other week has been since that time. No one doubted the literal nature of this week until individuals arose who, for various selfish reasons, did not feel inclined to accept the Bible story. Even many of those who still believed that God had created all things, were inclined to be influenced by the speculations of unbelievers, and came to believe more and more in the principle of uniformity. They thought that the work of some of the days of creation week, that of the third, for instance, was too great to be compressed into a single twenty-four-hour period. Gradually, under the impact of the philosophy of evolution, the completely unjustifiable doctrine that the days of creation week were long periods of geological time has become the popular teaching in most modern churches.

We most certainly recognize the fact that the actual discoveries of science should aid us in making the correct explanations of certain Bible texts. Nature and the Bible have the same Author, so they will never contradict each other. Wherever the Bible record is as clearly expressed as it is in Genesis 1, no conflict between the statements of Scripture and demonstrated scientific facts exists. There is *no necessity in nature* for attempting to explain the days of creation week as periods of geological time. Complete harmony exists between the clear-cut statements of Genesis and the order of nature about us.

Evolution teaches that man is a glorified beast, a creature who has never fallen, but who has always climbed higher and higher. Such an origin for man would make the death of Christ of no effect in his behalf. However, the self-evident truth of the statements of Genesis assures man that he is not a descendant of beasts, but, instead, can trace his lineage back to "Adam, which was the son of God" (Luke 3:38). This fact places man in line for redemption and reinstatement into the household of God through the death of Christ. Meditation upon this tremendous fact will lead the individual who seeks for truth to realize that evolution is a false doctrine. *-Signs of the Times,* 2/21/50

---

1 Charles Schuchert and Carl O. Dunbar, "A Textbook of Geology, Part II—Historical Geology," page 72.
2 Frants Buhl, "Gesenius's Handwoerterbuch ueber das alte Testament."
3 Brown, Driver, Briggs, "A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament."
4 Eduard Koenig, "Woerterbuch zum Alten Testament."
5 John Skinner, "International Critical Commentary (Genesis)."
6 August Dillmann, "Die Genesis."
7 Harry Rimmer, "Modern Science and the Genesis Record," page 12.

3.95

**THE TRANSFORMIST ILLUSION** ~~$3.50~~
*By Douglas Dewar.* A new concrete, scientific discussion of evolutionary theory. If you want a completely scientific denunciation of evolutionary doctrine by one who deals with it at its source, using its own documents and terminology, this is it.

**GOD AND THE COSMOS. Theodore Graebner.** A Critical Examination of Atheism, Materialism and Evolutionism. 453 pages. **$3.50**

By D. J. Whitney

# Earth History Is Tied To Human History

Earth history is tied to the history of mankind. There should be no question about that. When geologists try to decide about the age and history of the earth they tie it to what they think is the history of plant and animal life, and there is no question about that. Get any book on historical geology and you will see this.

By present, or at least very recent beliefs of geologists, the earth is probably ten or twelve billion years old, give or take a few billion years, but the earliest fossils--of simple marine plants (algae)-found in the Karoo area of South Africa are dated by radioactivity as three or four billion years old, although marine invertebrate fossils in great number and variety are thought to have first lived only about 550 million years ago.

That is a long time ago, and during the time between then and the time that certain higher flowering plants like the grasses and the netted veined flowering plants like oaks and clovers appeared in great numbers the land surfaces would be so subject to erosion from water falling on them that they would be worn away and carried into the sea as mud silt, or in solution.

A very plain fact is that except in a few cases where we know that some "Sedimentary rocks" are younger than others, like the material that holds elephants and some other existing or recently extinct kinds of animals in deep freeze in Arctic regions, and some more or less parallel cases elsewhere, all the sedimentary rocks and their contents seem to have been formed in one great recent remaking of the face of the upper earth and the uplift of present lands, and one fossil should be held as old as the others unless, as as just indicated, there is evidence that it was formed later.

"Look at the record" is excellent advice in every problem where there is a record. American geologists emphasize the supposed fact of a great ice age when an ice cap many thousands of feet high covered the Arctic ocean and the lands around it and extended far down into the central part of the United States. If such an ice continent existed, tying Europe, Asia, and North America into one apparent land mass it is certain that the ice would never melt, and the northern half of the northern hemisphere would be so cold for one thing, and the ice surface would be so high above sea level, that the ice would not melt, though some would evaporate, or ablate, into the atmosphere.

Looking at the record by standard teaching, this is what we seem to find: Only a few thousand years ago (any geologist may say when he thinks that was) elephants of several kinds and a great variety of other animals of warm climates were suddenly put into deep freeze and they are found in frozen muds in working gravels for gold north of the Yukon. (For details of this see *National Geographic Magazine*, June, 1956). The fact is well known. So the upper earth tells us that warm blooded animals in great numbers and variety were living in Siberia, Alaska, and on islands of the Arctic only a few thousand years ago.

However, most lands southward from the Arctic through northern and eastern Canada to the latitude of the Great Lakes contain few fossils. Where there are, of sea or land, they are likely to be of recent kinds, and when we get down to Florida, mostly low lying, this is emphatically the case. Numerous fossils are found there, including those of existing or recently extinct kinds. What is indicated *without question* is the recent uplift of all lands there and the burial of every plant and animal in these lands; and following this was the uplift of the rest of the surface of the earth, except that some volcanic land surfaces formed much later than others. The facts should be plain and their implications recognized.

But do not stop at Florida. Go to other parts of the world: Europe, Asia, Africa, Indonesia and even Australia, whose indigenous land mammals mostly differ radically from those of most of the rest of the world, and in all of these human fossils are found. Some years ago Indonesia was the main hunting grounds of anthropologists as the probable home of the ancestors of mankind, but little more is to be expected there, and Africa, partly because of its existing and extinct ape kinds, is believed to be the birthplace of early men. But let that be as it may, all present lands were uplifted from below sea level only a few thousand years ago, and there is no question about it, and on that basis no evidence exists of great antiquity for the ancestors of any living plant or animal. If there is, the finder of said fossil, or some high ranking geologist should give some better evidence than radiocarbon dating for it.

Now look at the record as it is provided by pure geology. California, birthplace and present home of this writer, seems to give stronger evidence of a great recent remaking of the land areas of the world than any other part of the earth's area. The highest spot in the U.S. south of Canada is the top of Mt. Whitney in the southern Sierra Nevada range, not rising to a pointed peak, but rounded at the top and with the eastern slope falling off almost perpendicularly for many thousands of feet. This Sierra Nevada range contains the greatest mass of granite above sea level of any part of the United States, and it also contains much limestone south and west of Mt. Whitney, with some small lava flows, while volcanic material is abundant to the north and northwest, where much gold was taken from gravel worked by hand many decades ago.

In working this gravel by hand numerous human bones and artifacts were found, including the famous Calaverous skull, which achieved much fame throughout the civilized world and was often mentioned until such evidence against a great antiquity for mankind embarassed the scientists and official Science seems to have lost interest in this matter. Nevertheless the fact remains that not only were human bones and artifacts found in these gravels, but also bones of other extinct animals, including elephants, saber-toothed felines, and so on. Nowhere on earth can fossils be held, rightly, to be older than these.

Various early writings of the first State Geologist, Joshua Dwight Whitney, and his first assistant, who did most of the direct investigation of the geology of the state, show that something like the northern four fifths of the surface of the state is more broken up, probably, than any comparable area in any part of the world that contains much sedimentary rock along with crustal rock and a good deal of volcanic material for good measure.

THE CREATIONIST
Published by
CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE LEAGUE
Box 173, Malverne, N.Y 11565

READ: "EVOLUTION A
RELIGIOUS DOGMA" 50¢
CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE LEAGUE
MALVERNE, N. Y. 11565

In the central and northern part of the state is a long central basin, much wider in the southern part than in the north, and running in a north, northwesterly direction, completely surrounded with steep sloped mountains, saving where rivers from the north and south unite to flow westerly and southernly into two smaller bays and then into the northern part of San Francisco bay, and then out into the ocean. On the East is the Sierra Nevada range and on the west the Coast Range mountains, and from the floor of the valley rises steeply the northern slope of the Tehachipi range of Southern California, composed mostly of typical sedimentary rocks, often rich in fossils, but fossils in the northern three-fourths of California tend to be limited to small areas, so broken and intruded by crustal rocks of various time that it is impossible to classify them in any order of age. For all that can be seen one very great remaking of the face of the ancient world took place only a few thousand years ago when present lands were uplifted.

But let us mention one striking geological fact before discussing the geology of Southern California from the Tehachipi mountains south. The General Sherman sequoia tree in Sequoia National Park in Tulare county is 273 feet high, 101 feet in circumference at ground level and its weight is estimated at 2,145 tons. Without question it is the largest and probably the oldest tree in the world, though the General Sherman tree in Fresno county to the northeast is almost as large; and here is a remarkable geological fact. The areas of the Sequoia National Forest and Park is drained by the Kaweah River, and it is said,

-continued page 74

**CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE LEAGUE**

P. O. Box 173

Malverne, New York 11565

Please add 3% for postage.

*All prices subject to change without notice.*

**CEL PUBLICATIONS**

| | |
|---|---|
| Finn, A. H. | |
| The Author of the Pentateuch | ~~1.25~~ |
| Price, George McCready: | |
| Problems and Methods in Geology | 1.00 |
| Were the Fossils Contemporary | .25 |
| Feet of Clay: The Unscientific Nonsense of Historical Geology | .25 |
| Fox, H. E. | |
| Our Lord and His Bible | .35 |
| Hopkins, Mark: | |
| Exclusive Traits of Christianity | .25 |
| Hastings, H. L.: | |
| The Bible and Its Critics | .25 |
| Friendly Hints to Candid Inquirers Who Disbelieve the Bible | .25 |
| Bates, William H.: | |
| A Study in the Genealogy of Jesus | .15 |
| Whitney, D. J.: | |
| Face of the Deep | ~~2.50~~ |
| How Did the Earth Originate | .15 |
| How Old Is the Earth | .15 |
| The Noachian Deluge | .25 |
| The Animals and the Ark | .15 |
| Cause of the Deluge and Related Problems | .15 |
| Fawthrop, F. W.: | |
| Did Moses Write the Pentateuch | .10 |
| The Creationist. 1, 2, 3 & 4 | ea. .30 |